



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/565,979	11/05/2007	Antoni Torrens Jover	283726US0PCT	9435
22850	7590	12/15/2009	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.			O DELL, DAVID K	
1940 DUKE STREET				
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1625	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/15/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com  
oblonpat@oblon.com  
jgardner@oblon.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/565,979	<b>Applicant(s)</b> TORRENS JOVER ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> David K. O'Dell	<b>Art Unit</b> 1625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 October 2009.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 22-24, 29, 57 and 58 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 22-24, 29, 57 and 58 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/06)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This application is a 371 of PCT/EP04/08508 filed 07/29/2004, which claims priority to Espana P200301813 filed 07/30/2003.

Claims 22-24, 29, 57-58 are pending.

### ***Claim Rejections/Objections Withdrawn***

3. The objections/rejections of canceled claims are withdrawn, the arguments rendered moot. The objections to claims 22-24, 29 are withdrawn based upon the amendment.

### ***Claim Rejections/Objections Maintained/ New Grounds of Rejection***

4. The claims 22-24, 29, 57-58 are now considered on their merits as detailed in the rejections below.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103**

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 22, 29, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO03/0100159 (cited on the IDS and ISR). The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:


**Determination of the scope and content of the prior art**

*(MPEP 2141.01)*

WO03/0100159 teaches compounds of claim 22-24, 29, 57-58, as the Formula I (page 3 where m and n are 2):

**5    Detailed description of the invention**

The present invention relates therefore first to new carboxylic acid amide derivatives of formula (I)



(I)

- wherein:

V and U independently are hydrogen or halogen atom, hydroxyl, cyano, nitro, amino, C<sub>1</sub>-C<sub>4</sub> alkylamino optionally substituted by a halogen atom or halogen atoms, arylamino optionally substituted by a halogen atom or halogen atoms, aralkylamino optionally substituted by a halogen atom or halogen atoms, C<sub>1</sub>-C<sub>4</sub> alkylsulfonamido optionally substituted by a halogen atom or halogen atoms, C<sub>1</sub>-C<sub>4</sub> alkanoylamido optionally substituted by a halogen atom or halogen atoms, arylsulfonamido, C<sub>1</sub>-C<sub>4</sub> alkylsulfonyloxy, carboxyl, trifluoromethyl, trifluoromethoxy, C<sub>1</sub>-C<sub>4</sub> alkyl-SO<sub>2</sub>-NH-CH<sub>2</sub>-, NH<sub>2</sub>-(CH<sub>2</sub>)<sub>4</sub>-SO<sub>2</sub>-NH-, NH<sub>2</sub>-(CH<sub>2</sub>)<sub>4</sub>-(CO)-NH-, sulfamoyl [NH<sub>2</sub>-SO<sub>2</sub>-], formyl [-CHO], amino-methyl [-CH<sub>2</sub>-NH<sub>2</sub>], hydroxymethyl, C<sub>1</sub>-C<sub>4</sub> alkyl, C<sub>1</sub>-C<sub>4</sub> alkoxy, methoxy, halogenmethyl, tetrazolyl group, or C<sub>1</sub>-C<sub>4</sub> alkoxy, C<sub>1</sub>-C<sub>4</sub> alkoxy-carbonyl, C<sub>1</sub>-C<sub>6</sub> alkanoyloxy, phenyl or C<sub>1</sub>-C<sub>4</sub> alkoxy groups, optionally substituted by amino group, or

Art Unit: 1625

W and X independently are -CO-, -CH<sub>2</sub>- or -CH(-alkyl)- groups - wherein alkyl is a C<sub>1</sub>-C<sub>4</sub> alkyl group groups - with the restriction, that the meaning of W and X can not be methylene at the same time

Y is oxygen atom, as well as C<sub>1</sub>-C<sub>4</sub> alkylene, C<sub>1</sub>-C<sub>4</sub> alkynylene, cycloalkylene, aminocarbonyl, -NH-, -N(alkyl)-, -CH<sub>2</sub>O-, -CH(OH)-, -OCH<sub>2</sub>- group, - wherein alkyl is a C<sub>1</sub>-C<sub>4</sub> alkyl group -,

Z is hydrogen or halogen atom, nitro, amino, C<sub>1</sub>-C<sub>4</sub> alkyl, C<sub>1</sub>-C<sub>4</sub> alkoxy, cyano, trifluoromethyl, hydroxyl or carbonyl group,

R<sup>1</sup> and R<sup>2</sup> independently are hydrogen atom c

This generic description is supported by numerous examples, where m and n are 2, W is CO and X is CH<sub>2</sub>. The compounds correspond to those of the instant claims where R11 is unsubstituted phenyl.

### **Ascertainment of the difference between the prior art and the claims**

It is clear that the prior art differs only in the individual compounds prepared.

*(MPEP 2141.02)*

### *Finding of prima facie obviousness*

#### *Rational and Motivation*

*(MPEP 2142-2143)*

At least where R11 of the instant claims is unsubstituted phenyl, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to use compounds such as those described in the teaching of the prior art to produce the instant invention.

A reference is good not only for what it teaches by direct anticipation but also for what one of ordinary skill in the art might reasonably infer from the teachings. (*In re Opprecht* 12 USPQ 2d 1235, 1236 (Fed Cir. 1989); *In re Bode* 193 USPQ 12 (CCPA) 1976). In light of the forgoing discussion, the Examiner concludes that the subject matter defined by the instant claims would have been obvious within the meaning of 35 USC 103(a). From the teachings of the references, it is apparent that one of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in producing the claimed invention. Therefore, the invention as a whole was *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, as evidenced by the references, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

One of ordinary skill is also one of “ordinary creativity, not an automaton”. See *Leapfrog Enterprises Inc. v. Fisher-Price. and Mattel Inc.* UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT “An obviousness determination is not the result of a rigid formula disassociated from the consideration of the facts of a case. Indeed, the common sense of those skilled in the art demonstrates why some combinations would have been obvious where others would not. See *KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. , 2007 U.S. LEXIS 4745, 2007 WL 1237837, at 12 (2007) (“The combination of familiar elements according to known methods is likely to be obvious when it does no more than yield predictable results.”).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Art Unit: 1625

6. Claims 22-24, 29, 57-58 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for making salts of the claimed compounds, does not reasonably provide enablement for making solvates of the claimed compounds. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art of synthetic organic chemistry to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. "The factors to be considered [in making an enablement rejection] have been summarized as a) the quantity of experimentation necessary, b) the amount of direction or guidance presented, c) the presence or absence of working examples, d) the nature of the invention, e) the state of the prior art, f) the relative skill of those in that art, g) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, h) and the breadth of the claims", *In re Rainer*, 146 USPQ 218 (1965); *In re Colianni*, 195 USPQ 150, *Ex parte Formal*, 230 USPQ 546. In the present case the important factors leading to a conclusion of undue experimentation are the absence of any working example of a formed solvate, the lack of predictability in the art, and the broad scope of the claims. g) The state of the art is that is not predictable whether solvates will form or what their composition will be. In the language of the physical chemist, a solvate of organic molecule is an interstitial solid solution. This phrase is defined in the second paragraph on page 358 of West (Solid State Chemistry). West, Anthony R., "Solid State Chemistry and its Applications", Wiley, New York, 1988, pages 358 & 365. The solvent molecule is a species introduced into the crystal and no part of the organic host molecule is left out or replaced. In the first paragraph on page 365, West (Solid State Chemistry) says, "it is not usually possible to predict whether solid solutions will form, or if they do form what is their compositional extent". Thus, in the absence of experimentation one cannot predict if a particular solvent will solvate any particular crystal. One cannot predict the stoichiometry of

Art Unit: 1625

the formed solvate, i.e. if one, two, or a half a molecule of solvent added per molecule of host.

In the same paragraph on page 365 West (Solid State Chemistry) explains that it is possible to make meta-stable non-equilibrium solvates, further clouding what Applicants mean by the word solvate. Compared with polymorphs, there is an additional degree of freedom to solvates, which means a different solvent or even the moisture of the air that might change the stable region of the solvate. h) The breadth of the claims includes all of the thousands of compounds of formula I as well as the presently unknown list of solvents embraced by the term "solvate". Thus, the scope is broad. MPEP 2164.01(a) states, "A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. *In re Wright*, 999 F.2d 1557, 1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)." That conclusion is clearly justified here. Thus, undue experimentation will be required to practice Applicants' invention.

#### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned

with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

7. Claims 22-24, 29, 57-58 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-15, 19-21 of copending Application No. 10/566,399. The claims overlap in scope. The '399 application is drawn only to compounds where in the instant claims R11 is carbazole. The instant claims are broader, however the variable R11 may be carbazole, in addition the working examples that have carbazole support a carbazole genus. The compounds seem to be the same in many instances. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

#### *Conclusion*

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1625

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David K. O'Dell whose telephone number is (571)272-9071. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Janet Andres can be reached on (571)272-0867. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/David K. O'Dell/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1625

/Rita J. Desai/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1625

Application/Control Number: 10/565,979

Art Unit: 1625

Page 10